	Case 2:06-cv-00927-JCM-RJJ Docume	ent 91 Filed :	12/02/10 Page 1 of 3	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	DISTRIC	ICT OF NEVADA		
8	PAYROLL SOLUTIONS GROUP, LIMITED INC., et al.,	2:02-CV-00	0927 JCM (RJJ)	
9	Plaintiffs,	Date:	N/A	
10		Time:	N/A	
11	V.			
12	THE STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,			
13	Defendants.			
14		00000		
15	ORDER			
16	Presently before the court is defendants The State of Nevada, Department of Business and			
17	Industry, Division of Insurance, and Alice Ann Molasky-Arman, Nevada Commissioner of Insurance's motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #85). Plaintiffs Payroll Solutions Group Limited			
18 19	Inc. et al filed a notice of non-opposition. (Doc. #90).			
20	Summary judgment is appropriate when, viewing the facts in the light most favorable to the			
20	nonmoving party, there is no genuine issue of material fact which would preclude summary			
22	judgment as a matter of law. Once the moving party has satisfied its burden, it is entitled to			
23	summary judgment if the non-moving party fails to present, by affidavits, depositions, answers to			
24	interrogatories, or admissions on file, "specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial."			
25	Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986); Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c).			
26	Plaintiffs' amended complaint alleges causes of action for (1) declaratory relief, (2) injunctive			
27	relief, (3) violation of state sovereignty, (4) violation of substantive due process, (5) violation of civil			
28				
James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge				

Case 2:06-cv-00927-JCM-RJJ Document 91 Filed 12/02/10 Page 2 of 3

rights secured by the Nevada constitution, (6) abuse of process, (7) tortious interference with existing business expectancy, (8) tortious interference with existing contractual relations, (9) tortious interference with prospective economic advantage, and (10) trade defamation.

Defendants assert in their motion for summary judgment (doc. #85) that they are entitled to summary judgment on all claims against all defendants. Defendants rely on the court's ruling on the previous motion for summary judgment (doc. #66), and assert that it "necessarily disposes of all the causes of action within [p]laintiffs' complaint." On August 6, 2010, in the hearing on the motion, the court held that, based on well-established law, a statute such as NRS 616B.691(2) cannot determine whether an ERISA benefit plan is a MEWA or a single employer plan under ERISA. Further, the court held that NRS 616B.691(2) is preempted, and granted partial summary judgment in favor of the defendants.

Defendants now assert that "with the resolution of the dispositive legal issue, all claims for relief asserted by the plaintiff[s] necessarily fail[,] as they were all based on plaintiffs' erroneous interpretation of law which allowed them to consider themselves exempt from any state insurance regulation or oversight."

The plaintiffs represent to the court that they do not intend to file an opposition to the motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #90). Thus, the court can conclude that they concede with the allegations of defendants, that the claims in their second amended complaint "necessarily disintegrate for failure of foundation on essential elements of the plaintiffs' case."

As the plaintiffs failed to present the court with "specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial," this court is inclined to grant the defendants' motion for summary judgment (doc. #85). With regards to the first cause of action, declaratory relief, the court holds that as the employee benefit plan offered by the plaintiffs is a MEWA pursuant to ERISA, it is subject to the laws and regulations of the state of Nevada, specifically, the Nevada Insurance Code.

Accordingly,

Ⅱ..

27 | .

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED ADJUDGED AND DECREED that defendants The State of Nevada, Department of Business and Industry, Division of Insurance, and Alice Ann Molasky-Arman, Nevada Commissioner of Insurance's motion for summary judgment (doc. #85) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED as to all claims against all defendants. DATED this 2nd day of December, 2010.

Case 2:06-cv-00927-JCM-RJJ Document 91 Filed 12/02/10 Page 3 of 3

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge